

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference SPE00252/WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/002922	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 19 March 2004 (19.03.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 21 March 2003 (21.03.2003)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC 7 D01F 4/02, D01D 5/06, 5/28			
Applicant SPIN'TEC ENGINEERING GMBH			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

Date of issuance of this report 23 September 2005 (23.09.2005)	
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer Ellen Moyse Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 75

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 25 NOV 2004

PCT

WIPO

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No. PCT/EP2004/002922	International filing date (day/month/year) 19.03.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 21.03.2003
--	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
D01F4/02, D01D5/06, D01D5/28

Applicant
SPIN'TEC ENGINEERING GMBH

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Mangin, S

Telephone No. +31 70 340-1974



Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material:

a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material:

in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing:

contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application,
 claims Nos. in part

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
 the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1-91 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
see separate sheet
 the claims, or said claims Nos. 1-91 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
 no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/002922

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-91
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-91
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-91
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Present claims 1-91 relate to an extremely large number of possible products, apparatuses and methods. Support within the meaning of Article 6 PCT and disclosure within the meaning of Article 5 PCT is to be found, however, for only a very small proportion of the products, apparatuses and methods claimed. In the present case, the claims so lack support, and the application so lacks disclosure, that a meaningful search over the whole of the claimed scope is impossible. The claims contain so many options that a lack of clarity within the meaning of Article 6 PCT arises: in the independent claims 1, 5, 29, 53, 64, 75-76, 83 the terms "filler elements", "composite material", "further compound" or "other compound" are vague and imprecise and leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which they refer.

Consequently, the search has been carried out for those parts of the application which do appear to be clear and supported namely p.12, I.4-23, p.3, I.5-19, p.15, I.18-p.16, I.2 and the independent claims 1, 5, 29, 53, 64, 75, 76, 83 in combination with the dependent claims.

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following document:

D1: WO 0138614

1. Novelty - Art 33(2) PCT

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-91 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

The document D1 discloses (p.8, I.34-p.9, I.24, p.10, I.7-I.19, p.13, I.5-I.27, p.20, I.35-p.21, I.10) a method of forming a bicomponent fiber comprising one or more proteins with filler elements. The method comprises preparing a solution preparing a dope with a

mixture of proteins (spider or worm silk proteins, spidroins, fibroins...) and constituents to keep the proteins in solution. These constituents are then removed through the semipermeable porous walls when it is desired to induce the transition from liquid dope to solid thread or fiber. The dope within the tubular passage can then be brought by dialysis against an appropriate acid or base buffer solution to a pH value close to one of the constituent proteins of the dope to promote the formation of an insoluble material, to produce droplets for example. The tubular passage has a convergent or a divergent geometry, inducing a certain orientation of the filler particles. The apparatus used has a storage compartment, a separation compartment and an extrusion compartment.

The subject-matter of claims 1-91 is therefore not novel over D1.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

Claims 54, 58-63, 65, 69-74 attempt to define the apparatus according to the composition of the starting solution. The composition of the starting solution, cannot be considered has as a technical feature of the apparatus.

Furthermore, claims 20, 25, 44, 49 attempt to define the subject-matter in terms of the result to be achieved, which merely amounts to a statement of the underlying problem, without providing the technical features necessary for achieving this result.